DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 384 FL 016 661

AUTHOR Bush, Brian J.
TITLE A Comparison of Innovative Training Techniques at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center. Research Report 1426.
INSTITUTION Army Research Inst. for the Behavioral and Social Sciences Field Unit, Presidio of Monterey, CA.
PUB DATE Jun 86
NOTE 74p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Acceleration (Education); Armed Forces; *Classroom Techniques; Comparative Analysis; Educational Strategies; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Instructional Innovation; Learning Strategies; Pacing; Research Utilization; Russian; Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Programs; Student Attitudes; *Suggestopedia; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Defense Language Institute CA

ABSTRACT

A study evaluated the comparative training effectiveness of three language instruction methods: (1) suggestopedia, (2) the standard methodology used at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, a functional skill-building approach, and (3) a flexible-scheduling version of the standard methodology, with pacing based on group readiness. The subjects were junior enlisted Army and Navy personnel in a Russian basic course. Results indicate that the suggestopedia approach neither accelerated learning nor resulted in more positive overall attitudes in students when compared with either the standard or flexibly scheduled groups. However, the flexible-scheduling method did save one week's instructional time. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED281384

FL

Research Report 1426

A Comparison of Innovative Training Techniques at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center

Brian J. Bush

ARI Field Unit at Presidio of Monterey, California

Training Research Laboratory

U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

June 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Bush

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL016661

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the

Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

WM. DARRYL HENDERSON
COL, IN
Commanding

Technical review by

Judith E. Brooks
Bruce Sterling, Soldiers Support Center

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI-POT, 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600.

FINAL DISPOSITION: This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER ARI Research Report 1426	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) A COMPARISON OF INNOVATIVE TRAINING TECHNIQUES AT THE DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CENTER		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Report January 1985-November 1985 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER --
7. AUTHOR(s) Brian J. Bush		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) --
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute Field Unit at the Presidio of Monterey PO Box 5787, Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5011		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q263743A794
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, VA 22333-5600		12. REPORT DATE June 1986 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 73
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office) --		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE --

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

--

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

--

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Foreign language training	Innovative training techniques
Language training in the military	Accelerated learning
Learning strategies	Traditional instruction
Instructional strategies	Suggestopedia
Flexibly scheduled pacing	

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

This report documents the results of an evaluation of the comparative training effectiveness of (1) suggestopedia (i.e., a method proposed to accelerate language learning), (2) the standard instructional methodology currently used by the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC), and (3) a flexible-scheduling version of the DLIFLC method (i.e., the flexibly scheduled presentation of material based upon group readiness).

(Continued)

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ARI Research Report 1426

20. (Continued)

The subjects were 40 junior enlisted Army personnel scheduled to take the Russian Basic Course (RBC). They were randomly selected and sorted into two sections each for the suggestopedia and standard groups. One section of 10 junior enlisted Army and Navy personnel comprised the flexibly scheduled group.

Analyses of variance, combined with subsequent one-tailed t-tests, found that the suggestopedia group had significantly lower scores than the two DLIFLC groups on the written and oral components of achievement tests. Similar significant differences among the groups were found on the reading and speaking components of the Proficiency Advancement Test (PAT). No significant differences were found among groups on the listening component of the PAT. There were no significant differences between the standard and flexibly scheduled groups on the achievement tests, the PAT, or on the face-to-face oral interviews.

Comparisons among groups on the various attitudinal measures indicated significantly more positive attitudes by the suggestopedia group toward their instructor for the first 4 weeks when compared to the standard group. There were no differences between groups on any other results from the weekly surveys, and between pre- and posttests results for any of the groups. On the 12 individual scales comprising the end-of-course questionnaire, results were similar among groups on 9 of the scales. On the "Language Use Anxiety" scale, the suggestopedia group indicated more comfort with the language; on the "Effort Required" scale, they felt that the methodology required little or no effort to learn the language; and on the "Course Materials" scale, the two DLIFLC groups felt more positive about their course materials.

In conclusion, suggestopedia neither accelerated learning nor resulted in more overall positive attitudes in students when compared to either the standard or flexibly scheduled groups. The evaluation of the flexible-scheduling methodology did indicate a time saving of approximately 1 week.

Research Report 1426

A Comparison of Innovative Training Techniques at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center

Brian J. Bush

ARI Field Unit at Presidio of Monterey, California
Jack H. Hiller, Chief

Training Research Laboratory
Harold Wagner, Acting Director

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600

Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
Department of the Army

June 1986

Army Project Number
2Q263743A794

Education and Training

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

ARI Research Reports and Technical Reports are intended for sponsors of R&D tasks and for other research and military agencies. Any findings ready for implementation at the time of publication are presented in the last part of the Brief. Upon completion of a major phase of the task, formal recommendations for official action normally are conveyed to appropriate military agencies by briefing or Disposition Form.

FOREWORD

The Presidio of Monterey Field Unit of the U.S. Army Research Institute has as its primary mission the execution of research to improve training to better meet unit mission requirements. One aspect of such training has been the area of foreign language.

The Presidential Commission Report (1979) and the 1982 Government Accounting Office (GAO) report entitled "Weaknesses in the Resident Language Training System of Defense Language Institute Affect the Quality of Trained Linguists" emphasized the need to identify alternative methodologies for teaching languages.

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) currently uses the Progressive Skill Integration (PSI) approach, a functional skill-building approach to language learning that progresses through a number of stages, beginning with the perception of new concepts and culminating with the acquisition of working communication skills. Though this system has been effective, the DLIFLC and other Army language trainers continue to examine methods to improve training.

This report provides a comprehensive summary of a research effort that compared and evaluated three of these methods: the suggestopedia, a flexible-scheduling methodology, and the standard DLIFLC methodology currently used.

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The support, assistance, cooperation, and contributions of the below listed activities and personnel are acknowledged:

ARI Presidio of Monterey Field Unit, especially:

Ms. A. Ekstrom, for her participation in the development of the evaluation plan, her major effort in the development of the attitudinal measurement instruments used in this study, and her review and comments on this report.

Dr. O. Kahn and Dr. L. Meliza, for their review and comments on this report.

Dr. D. Goehring, for his assistance in the development of the statistical analysis plan.

Ms. T. Kemper, for her assistance in performing the statistical analysis for this study.

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) staff and faculty, especially:

Dr. J. Hutchinson, Assistant Dean of Students, who, as the Director of the School of Russian during the study, was instrumental in the concept development of the study and the management of the logistical requirements to conduct the study.

Dr. J. Lett, Evaluation Division, for his efforts in developing the evaluation plan for this study as well as his involvement in the development of attitudinal measurement instruments.

Ms. L. Solgalow, Chairperson of the School of Russian, for her assistance in developing materials, providing academic performance records, explaining academic policies and school procedures, providing schedules, and meeting a variety of unanticipated needs.

Ms. K. Slabbers and Ms. A. Velikoshapko, instructors for the standard DLIFLC methodology, for their tolerance of classroom interruptions to administer instruments, videotape, and allow classroom observations.

Ms. N. Marchinko-Fryberger and Ms. S. Mineyev, instructors for the flexibly scheduled class, for their development and implementation of the flexible-scheduling methodology.

LTC L. Edwards, Mr. J. Broz, Ms. A. Frazier, and Ms. B. Ludgate, Office of Organizational Effectiveness, for conducting end-of-course interviews and preparing the subsequent report.

Mr. J. Gordon and Ms. M. Martin, Lozanov Learning Systems Inc., instructors for the suggestopedia methodology, for their adaptability of the suggestopedia methodology to the DLIFLC environment, their explanations of various instructional activities, and their tolerance of classroom interruptions.

Mr. L. Willis, Defense Manpower Data Center, Department of Defense, for providing ASVAB data.

A COMPARISON OF INNOVATIVE TRAINING TECHNIQUES AT THE DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CENTER

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Requirement:

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) and the Soldier Support Center (SSC) requested that the Army Research Institute (ARI) assess the effectiveness of and students' attitudes toward suggestopedia instruction relative to the standard DLIFLC instruction currently employed. The study also included a comparison of a flexible-scheduling methodology identified by the DLIFLC as a target of opportunity.

Procedure:

Fifty junior enlisted Army and Navy personnel were initially examined. Twenty Army students received the suggestopedia instruction, and 20 received the standard DLIFLC instruction. Ten Army and Navy students received the flexible-scheduling instructional methodology.

Achievement tests, a Proficiency Advancement Test (PAT), and face-to-face oral interviews were used as criteria of training effectivness. Achievement tests were administered after the presentation of a block of instruction called a module. The PAT and oral interviews were administered to each group when they completed the course materials comprising Term I, the period used for this study. Completion dates were 10 weeks for the suggestopedia methodology, 14 weeks as retrospectively observed for the flexible-scheduling methodology, and 15 weeks as normally planned for the standard DLIFLC methodology. Attitudes were assessed at the beginning and end of the term, and at weekly intervals. Student demographic variables were represented by military rank, military occupational specialty (MOS), age, years of military service, educational level, prior language training, and gender. Additional descriptive variables for the student population included Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB) scores, General Technical (GT) scores, and a pretest of attitudes about the potential advantages of learning Russian and about foreign languages in general.

Findings:

The available data showed that the suggestopedia methodology was not as effective after 10 weeks of study as the flexibly scheduled instruction after 14 weeks or the standard DLIFLC instruction after 15 weeks. In fact, the suggestopedia group had significantly lower scores on all measures of academic performance with the exception of results on the listening component of the PAT and the oral interviews. Measures of attitudes indicated that the suggestopedia group was more positive toward their instructor(s) during the first 4 weeks,

but then fell to the level of the two DLIFLC groups. On attitudes compared at the conclusion of the course, the suggestopedia group generally felt more comfortable about its ability to use the Russian language and felt that less effort had been required when compared to the other groups. The flexibly scheduled and standard DLIFLC groups felt more positive about their course materials, but also had more hands-on (workbooks) and take-home materials (workbooks and testbooks). A comparison between pre- and posttest results indicated no attitude changes within these two groups.

Utilization of Findings:

This research implies that suggestopedia, as a whole, would not justify a change in the standard DLIFLC instructional methodology. However, suggestopedia's use as an enrichment adjunct to the curriculum may warrant further research. Additionally, components of the suggestopedia methodology may affect factors such as student attrition and memory retention, thereby warranting further research.

The evaluation of the flexible-scheduling methodology indicates that students can progress through the curriculum at a faster pace than usual. Further research may be necessary to determine whether this is an effect of the instruction or the curriculum.

A COMPARISON OF INNOVATIVE TRAINING TECHNIQUES AT THE DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CENTER

CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION		1
METHOD		8
RESULTS		11
DISCUSSION		21
REFERENCES		23
APPENDIX A.	WRITTEN COMPONENT (ACHIEVEMENT TESTS)	A-1
B.	ORAL COMPONENT (ACHIEVEMENT TESTS)	B-1
C.	LISTENING COMPREHENSION, PROFICIENCY ADVANCEMENT TEST (I)	C-1
D.	READING COMPREHENSION, PROFICIENCY ADVANCEMENT TEST (I)	D-1
E.	SPEAKING COMPONENT, PROFICIENCY ADVANCEMENT TEST (I)	E-1
F.	WEEKLY ATTITUDE SURVEY INSTRUMENT	F-1
G.	PRETEST AND POSTTEST QUESTIONNAIRE	G-1
H.	END-OF-COURSE QUESTIONNAIRE	H-1
I.	SCRIPT FOR STUDENT ORIENTATION ON EXPERIMENT	I-1
J.	DESCRIPTIONS AND RATINGS	J-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Means and Standard Deviations of Module Exam Averages by Section, and by Group	13
2.	Means and Standard Deviations of Written and Oral Module Results by Section, and by Group	13

Page

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations of Module I-V Scores by Group 14

4. Means and Standard Deviations of PAT Scores (Listening, Reading, and Speaking), and Face-to-Face Oral Interview Scores by Group 16

H-1. Description of the End-of-Course Questionnaire H-10

J-1. Ratings for the Speaking Portion of the PAT, and for the (Face-to-Face) Oral Interviews J-1

A COMPARISON OF INNOVATIVE TRAINING TECHNIQUES AT THE DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CENTER

INTRODUCTION

As part of the military's continued efforts to improve the quality of foreign language training, the Soldier Support Center (SSC) and Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) submitted a Concept Evaluation Plan (CEP) to the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) for the evaluation of an innovative training methodology called suggestopedia. In September, 1984, TRADOC approved the CEP and a contract was awarded to the Lozanov Learning Systems, Inc. (LLSI) to provide a resident course of instruction using the suggestopedia methodology. The Army Research Institute (ARI) was asked to conduct the evaluation of suggestopedia as compared to the standard instructional methodology currently used at the DLIFLC. A third methodology, using flexible scheduling of the presentation of materials, was modified from the standard DLIFLC course of instruction, identified as a "target of opportunity," and added to the study for evaluation. The objective of the research was to compare the effectiveness of the three methodologies using measures of academic performance, and analysis of students' attitudes about the respective instructional methodology.

The suggestopedia methodology is a unified system of instruction characterized by a variety of techniques emphasizing a relaxed and positive learning atmosphere. The instruction is delivered in situational contexts maximizing the use of the oral communicative skills (proficiency). The standard DLIFLC methodology used a Progressive Skill Integration (PSI) approach, which is a functional approach to language teaching that stresses the integration of the various components of language (i.e., pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, writing systems, etc.) into communication skills. It is a progressive approach in that students advance through a number of stages beginning with the perception of new concepts and culminating with the acquisition of working communication skills. The flexible-scheduling treatment is similar to the standard DLIFLC methodology except that the former uses a pacing of the presentation of materials based upon group readiness rather than a fixed schedule for the presentation of materials. Further discussion characterizing the methodologies may be found later in this chapter under the subtitle, "Description of Instructional Treatments."

Data from this study may be used in formulating subsequent research efforts on components of effective instruction that characterize the methodologies (e.g., functional practice, positive reinforcement, cueing, positive role modeling). Individual components found effective may be incorporated throughout a course of instruction.

Background

A review of the literature indicates mixed findings regarding suggestive-accelerated learning or suggestopedia. In addition, there is little evidence reflecting the study of suggestopedia in a military setting or with military personnel.

One review conducted within the Federal government was a self report experience with National Security Agency personnel at a five-week suggestopedia Russian Course cited by Shitama (1982). Overall remarks made by the ten NSA students and two NSA instructors (who only attended the one-week Lozanov instructor training workshop) concluded that while some features of suggestopedia were interesting and helpful, such as the use of music and relaxation techniques, the collective methodology is not recommended for individuals requiring a thorough grasp of the language. A report which involved Special Forces military personnel learning German with the suggestopedia methodology was conducted at Fort Devens, Massachusetts. Findings indicated a reduction in course length from 12 to 6 weeks. However, 10 of the 12 students had been previously exposed to German either in school or overseas (Dhority, 1984).

Studies conducted by Lozanov, the creator and developer of suggestopedia, suggest high success rates covering a range of topics from foreign language training to training in mathematics at virtually all age levels (Lozanov, 1978). One example is the teaching of a year of traditional foreign language curriculum in three and one-half months (Lozanov, 1975). However, these findings and others indicating high success rates have been found to lack "scientific validity" as noted by Bancroft (1976) and Scovel (1979) in his review of Lozanov's suggestopedia.

Kline (1974) found in many of Lozanov's studies highly motivated adults, experienced language teachers, and perfect attendance records which may result in high success rates regardless of the instructional methodology used. In an attempt to replicate some of Lozanov's work, Kline indicated that vocabulary achievement was approximately half of that reported by Lozanov.

Other studies (Benitez-Bordon & Schuster, 1976) indicate positive results but only for two-hour sessions once a week and with no control group. An experiment in teaching beginning Russian (Kurkov, 1971) indicated higher success rates for suggestopedia over traditional instruction, but it was noted that approximately twice as many students in the suggestopedia group had prior formal Russian language training. Additionally, the students in the suggestopedia group indicated that they needed to spend more time than usual in outside preparation such as vocabulary copying and reading grammar. Renard (1976) reviewed a study using suggestopedia to learn French but found that the suggestopedia group was comprised of volunteers while the control group was not.

Wagner and Tilney (1982) conducted an experiment comparing suggestopedia with traditional instructional methods for learning over five weeks. Results indicated no significant improvement by the suggestopedia group. In fact, it was found that the traditional group learned significantly more vocabulary.

Other studies evaluated characteristics found in the suggestopedia methodology. Several findings indicated an increase in performance levels for verbal learning and retention when students were provided with some relaxation techniques to reduce stress before testing on difficult material (Straughn & Dufort, 1969; Chaney & Andreasen, 1972). However, studies by Martin and Schuster (1977) and Lipsitt (1963) found that there seemed to be an optimal level of stress for learning. Some students were found to learn better if they felt a certain amount of stress. Overall the findings seemed to indicate

a curvilinear relationship between stress and learning. Learning increased as stress increased up to an optimum level, after which learning fell off as a function of increases in stress. This demonstrates the Yerkes-Dodson Law. For further reading see Sanders, Eng, and Murph (1985).

The components of music and imagery adapted from suggestopedia were studied for their separate and combined impact. Stein (1982) found that the addition of music and imagery together and music separately indicated a significant increase in the retention of vocabulary for college students when compared to the control group without treatment. Subjects in the music plus imagery group heard Handel's Water Music, and the experimenter read aloud the words to be studied. Subjects in the music only group heard just the music. The control group subjects had neither the words spoken nor the music, they had only the words to study.

Since this study deals with a comparison of specific instructional strategies and not learning theory in general, the following references are provided for futher reading as an overview of instructional strategies. Gagne and Dick (1982) review educational research and its implications for effective instruction. Bush (unpublished manuscript) discusses effective instructional strategies according to subject matter and student demographics. Weinstein and Mayer (1985) describe the application of learning theory in the classroom.

These citations seem to indicate a need for more empirical data on the suggestopedia methodology as well as a need to evaluate the specific components of suggestopedia instruction which may enhance learning.

Description of Instructional Methodologies

The treatments are first described and then compared as actually applied in the study. Certain modifications were necessitated by the limitations imposed by the experimental conditions. Modifications to the treatments, particularly suggestopedia, were done with the collaboration and approval of the contractor for suggestopedia, Lozanov Learning Systems, Inc., and the DLIFLC.

Suggestopedia Instructional Methodology. The suggestopedia method is designed to approximate many conditions of the early childhood learning process. It stresses role-playing, student participant dialogue, and a totally positive approach. The instructor(s) encourage interaction of the entire class through the use of positive reinforcement, stress relaxation, and confidence building techniques demonstrated or modeled by the instructor. The classroom environment is also relaxed, comfortable, and non-threatening. Subliminal stimuli are also important: the room, furniture, lighting, and positioning of class members are carefully selected and arranged to enhance student comfort while facilitating student-teacher interaction.

A phase of directed passivity alternates with an active phase. During the passive phase the student listens to material orally presented by the instructor with music in the background and without specific directions for retaining the material. During the active phase students role play and enact situations based on the thematic suggestions from the instructor(s).

Suggestopedia also emphasizes the importance of the instructor as a figure of authority and prestige while providing a relaxed, comfortable, and nonthreatening classroom environment.

The suggestopedia method of instruction claims to ensure the acquisition of communication skills with emphasis on verbal skills but also including reading and writing skills (Sterling, 1984).

Standard DLIFLC Instructional Methodology. The methodology described for the standard DLIFLC instruction is derived from a Progressive Skill Integration (PSI) process which involves the functions, contents, and accuracy components of the Interagency Language Roundtable Skill Level Descriptions (see appendix F for a detailed listing). (Since a measure of language accuracy is uncertain, especially at the beginning of the course, language accuracy is always measured in relation to the skill level descriptions and not to perfect grammar models [DLIFLC Pamphlet 350-10, 1982]).

The PSI process uses a functional approach to language instruction that stresses the integration of various components of language such as pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and writing into the communication skills of proficiency. The skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing are first developed through a series of learning activities based upon skill acquisition or achievement. Exercises such as memorizing dialogues, questions and answers, paraphrasing, role-playing, dictation, and translation are carried out through a process moving from conceptualization, through familiarization, and variation. Then a further step to stimulation and communication brings the student to application or proficiency activities. Teaching strategies such as audio-lingual (i.e., speaking-listening) and cognitive-code (i.e., inductive and deductive) techniques are used to accommodate varying student learning styles. Material is normally presented in authentic contexts at normal conversational speeds. The cultural and background information of the language is integrated into the course by using various audio-visual training aids. The curriculum becomes increasingly more proficiency-based and less achievement-oriented over the length of the course.

Flexible-Scheduling Instructional Methodology. The flexible-scheduling method was similar to the standard DLIFLC methodology. (It is not currently used in the format described in this study.) The major difference in design is that the former used a pacing of the presentation materials based upon the instructors' assessment of the group's readiness rather than a fixed schedule for the presentation of materials. The emphasis of the instruction was on speaking through exercises based upon the PSI approach. The weekly training schedule was the device used for implementing and monitoring the pace. For it's development, the instructors analyzed the value and function of each lesson component in terms of the group's ability to grasp and utilize the material presented. Daily discussions between instructors allowed for schedule changes to accommodate advancement, review, or remediation. Student input was incorporated into the schedule.

Contrasts Between Methodologies. The physical environment for the groups was different. The suggestopedia group had larger rooms for its sections. Room size was smaller and identical for the DLIFLC sections and was approximately one-half the size of the rooms used by suggestopedia sections. The suggestopedia group had swivel, high-back chairs and no desks. The DLIFLC

groups had standard wooden chairs and worked at tables. The suggestopedia group used Baroque and contemporary music. No music was used with the DLIFLC groups.

The suggestopedia group was not given homework whereas the other groups had specific homework assignments. Weekly graded exercises were used with the DLIFLC groups but not for the suggestopedia group. Module textbooks were provided to all students during inprocessing at DLIFLC, but the suggestopedia students were told they did not need them and they were seldom used according to self reports.

The suggestopedia group had one instructor per section whereas the standard DLIFLC group averaged four instructors per day, with one teaching three hours and considered to be the primary instructor. The flexibly-scheduled group had two instructors teaching an equal number of hours for the same daily six-hour schedule as the other two groups.

Suggestopedia emphasized oral practice with the omission of reading and writing skills, particularily during the first five-weeks. The standard group attempted an instructional balance between the three skills, while the flexibly-scheduled group attempted the same balance with slightly more emphasis on oral practice.

Other distinctions between the standard DLI instruction and suggestopedia were not as clear. This may be attributed to inconsistencies within the methodologies as applied in the classroom as well as to similarities among the methodologies. Mignault (1978), in his discussion of Lozanov's methods of suggestopedia, compared Lozanov's methods with certain critical aspects of language instruction and found that suggestopedia incorporated techniques noted elsewhere but which have apparently not been consolidated or adapted for use in a unified program of instruction. Examples of overlap include student participant dialogues and a positive approach by the instructor(s). These examples are emphasized by the suggestopedia methodology but are also applied in varying degrees by the two other methodologies.

The emphases on games and role-playing were more characteristic of the suggestopedia instructional process than to the DLIFLC instructional methodologies. The suggestopedia instruction was further distinguished by the teaching of patterning of information through intonation, pitch, rhythm, and proper breathing. It is worth noting that, toward the end of the study, the suggestopedia instructors were informed that Lozanov had reduced the emphasis on these characteristics. This was not considered by the suggestopedia instructors as having an effect on findings from this study.

Similarities Between Methodologies. The importance placed by suggestopedia on the authority and prestige of the instructor did not seem to differ from the two DLIFLC groups. This comparability may be an incidental consequence of the student population who, as military personnel, are expected to respond to teachers as figures of authority and prestige.

All groups were generally presented materials in authentic contexts and at conversational speed. The target language was used as much as possible, though more so with the suggestopedia group, particularly during the first two or three weeks.

All groups were administered and evaluated with the same measures of academic performance and student attitudes with the exception of the flexibly-scheduled group. This group was not initially identified for the administration of attitudinal measures due to a lack of certainty about its continuation, and incorporation into the study. The effects of testing and evaluation on the suggestopedia process of providing a less stressful, more relaxed atmosphere was an initial concern. However, the contractor representative for suggestopedia and the Lozanov Learning Systems, Inc. (LLSI) felt that the process and outcomes would not be adversely affected (Schleicher, 1985). Measures that addressed proficiency abilities were more acceptable to the contractor than the measures of achievement because of the instructional emphasis by suggestopedia on proficiency.

It is important to note at this point that certain influences on, or modifications to, the suggestopedia methodology at DLIFLC, such as the effect of testing on student stress cited earlier, were not considered by the LLSI contract representative to significantly affect achievement, proficiency, or attitudinal outcomes. Such modifications of the suggestopedia methodology considered acceptable included the classroom environment, course length, the selection process of student and instructor personnel, testing procedures, the degree of instructor familiarity with the testing instruments, and concurrent military duty requirements of the students (Schleicher, 1985).

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to compare the effectiveness of the suggestopedia method of instruction with the standard DLIFLC method currently used. An additional evalution was conducted of a flexibly-scheduled methodology, comparing it to both the suggestopedia and standard DLIFLC instruction.

Results from the comparisons of treatment effectiveness were used, in part, to determine whether the treatments could, wholly or partially, be acceptable and/or adaptable for utilization within Army language training programs.

Tests of equality among groups were conducted on descriptive variables considered to have a possible effect on treatment outcomes. No differences among groups were expected because the sample was drawn from a generally homogeneous population.

Tests of significance were conducted among groups on results from measures of academic performance. Further analyses were conducted as necessary for differences between groups and within group effect. Performance gains for the suggestopedia group after 10 weeks of language training were expected to be the same as the performance gains for the flexibly-scheduled and standard DLIFLC groups after 14 and 15 weeks respectively. This expectation was based upon the assertion that suggestopedia could accelerate learning (SSC Contract No. DABT-60-84-R-0080, 1984). No differences were expected between the flexibly-scheduled and standard DLIFLC groups because of the similarity of their methodologies and the short difference in time of one week between dates for the completion of the curriculum.

The suggestopedia group's highest scores were expected to be on the oral communicative skills measured, while the DLIFLC groups were expected to have comparable scores on all measures of academic performance. These expectations were derived from suggestopedia's emphasis on oral skills and the DLIFLC groups' instructional balance on each skill tested.

An analysis of variance was expected to find significant differences in student attitudes among groups. Student attitudes from the suggestopedia group were expected to be more positive then those found for the DLIFLC groups because of the emphasis placed upon strong positive student attitudes by the suggestopedia method. No differences were expected between the DLIFLC groups because of the similarities between the instructional methodologies, specifically the use of the Progressive Skill Integration (PSI) approach.

METHOD

Subjects

The study included forty junior enlisted Army personnel scheduled to begin the Russian Basic Course (RBC) randomly selected and sorted into two sections each for the suggestopedia (n=20) and standard DLIFLC (n=20) groups. One section of ten junior enlisted Army and Navy personnel comprised the flexibly-scheduled group. This group was previously identified and in place prior to its' incorporation into this study.

Design

The study design used matched assignments to the suggestopedia and standard DLIFLC methodologies. The following descriptive variables were used to match the two groups: military rank, military occupational specialty (MOS), age, years of military service, Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB) scores, educational level, prior language training, General Technical (GT) scores, and gender. Matching was not possible with the flexibly-scheduled group because of its later addition to the study.

The independent variables were the instructional methodologies. The dependent variables were the measures of academic performance and student attitudes toward their respective methodologies.

Instrumentation

Effectiveness was measured by academic performance and student attitudes toward their instructional methdologies.

Three measures of academic performance were used. One was a set of achievement or module tests. The achievement tests had two major components: written and oral. An example of each is provided in Appendixes A and B, respectively. Achievement tests are designed to measure performance on materials presented over the course of the study (fifteen weeks). Five achievement tests were administered with each covering a particular set of materials presented over different lengths of time. The sets of materials and allotted time for presentation were called modules. The modules varied, for example Module V had more material and required more time for presentation than any of the previous four modules. The groups completed the five modules according to the respective schedules (i.e., the suggestopedia group completed the five modules in ten weeks, the flexibly-scheduled group in fourteen weeks, and the standard DLIFLC group in fifteen weeks).

A second measure of academic performance used was the Proficiency Advancement Test (PAT), a combined measure of both achievement and proficiency. The distinction between achievement and proficiency is that achievement measures performance on course materials, while proficiency measures performance with the target language regardless of the course of instruction. The PAT had three components: listening, reading, and speaking. An example of each is provided in Appendixes C, D, and E, respectively.

The third measure of academic performance used was a face-to-face oral interview. This was added to the study to obtain a measure of conversational proficiency only, which most closely approximates suggestopedia's instructional emphasis. The method used a single blind technique in that the two rating instructors did not know which of the three methodologies the rated students experienced.

The measures of achievement only, achievement and proficiency, and proficiency only were used in order to provide for a more balanced and comprehensive evaluation of the three methodologies than would be available by looking at only achievement or proficiency.

Student attitudes toward their methodologies were measured using weekly attitude surveys, a pre- and posttest questionnaire, and an end-of-course questionnaire.

The weekly attitude survey used a 24-item semantic differential scale. It measured student attitudes about themselves while in class, their opinions about the class, and opinions about their instructor(s). A sample of this instrument is provided as Appendix F.

The questionnaire administered at the beginning and end of the study, the pre and posttest, was a 26-item Likert-type scale derived from the work of Gardner (personal communication, November 1, 1984). It addressed student attitudes about the potential advantages of learning Russian (Part A), and student attitudes about foreign languages in general (Part B). This instrument is provided as Appendix G. (Further reading on Gardner's attitude/motivational scales as related to language learning may be found in Gardner, [1983]; Gardner, Clement, Smythe, & Smythe, [1979]; Gardner & Lalonde [1983]; and Gliksman, Smythe, & Gardner [1982].)

The end-of-course questionnaire, as provided in Appendix H, was a developmental instrument, also based upon the work of Gardner, with 126 items measuring 12 attitudinal topics using a variety of scale types (i.e., Likert, semantic-differential, and multiple-choice). The scales included measures of attitudes toward the learning context, student motivation and anxiety, and attitudes designed to reflect some key characteristics of suggestopedia. The topics and associated scales are described in Table H-1.

Procedure

The study of the various instructional methodologies was conducted in a resident foreign language training environment at the DLIFLC, Monterey, California.

Prior to the study the students received an orientation from the Director of the School of Russian, DLIFLC, outlining the study. A copy of the orientation is provided as Appendix I. In addition, an informal briefing was provided to the experimental groups, suggestopedia and flexibly-scheduled, which stressed that there would be no negative effects as a result of any substandard academic performance during the course of the study.

Administration of the instruments consisted of distributing the attitude questionnaires, reading the privacy act statement and the standardized

instructions, and collecting the completed questionnaires. At the beginnning of the study, students were administered the pretest questionnaire. The weekly attitudinal survey was administered at the end of each week during language laboratory classes or during breaks between classes. All instructors delayed the start of a class if a student needed more time to complete a survey. Measures of academic performance were part of the regular class schedule. Results were returned after all groups had completed testing with the same instrument. The posttest and end-of-course questionnaires were administered during language laboratories at the conclusion of the study according to the completion of the Term I (five modules) curriculum for each of the methodologies; the suggestopedia and standard DLIFLC methodologies projected completion dates were weeks 10 and 15 respectively; the flexibly-scheduled group found that they finished Term I in 14 weeks.

An additional assessment of student attitudes was conducted by the DLIFLC Office of Organizational Effectiveness at the conclusion of the study and is available as a supplementary report (Edwards, 1985).

RESULTS

Descriptive Variables

Tests of equality found no significant differences on descriptive variables considered to have a potential effect on treatment outcomes. The variables examined are as follows: military rank, military occupational specialty (MOS), age, years of military service, Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB) scores, educational level, prior language training, General Technical (GT) scores, gender, and a pretest measure of student attitudes about foreign languages in general and the potential advantages of learning Russian. (A comparison between pretest and posttest results may be found in the section titled, "Measures of Student Attitudes".)

The GT score is considered an approximate measure of both verbal ability and arithmetic reasoning. Because of the particularly close relationship between verbal ability and language learning, tests of group equivalency were conducted on both components. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) found no significant differences among groups on either measure.

The DLAB and GT scores are measures of two criteria used for accepting personnel into the residence language training program at the DLIFLC. Therefore they were isolated for comparison with the 1984 student population. Tests of equality found the study sample to be representative of the 1984 Russian Basic Course Army enlisted student population on both DLAB and GT scores.

Measures of Academic Performance

Achievement Measures

Achievement or module tests comprised one of the three types of measures of academic performance. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted on the two components of the achievement tests, written and oral. An additional ANOVA was conducted on the weighted exam average. The weighted exam average was the higher value assigned, by the DLIFLC, to the written component as compared to the oral component when averaging both scores together. (Since the completion of this study, the DLIFLC has been in the process of changing this emphasis on the written component toward an equal weighting between both.) The suggestopedia group had significantly lower scores than the two DLIFLC groups on the written and oral components, and the exam averages. There were no differences between the two DLIFLC groups.

The number of students available for the administration of a given instrument or component thereof was subject to student availability. Student availability was affected by such factors as medical problems and changes in military duty assignments. Therefore, the number of cases for a statistical test varies.

Written Scores. One of the two main components of the achievement tests was the written component. Scores are presented as percentages with a possible range of 0-100. As expected the treatment effect was significantly

different among groups on the written component of the achievement tests, $F(2,46) = 48.21$, $p<.001$. Subsequent t-tests found that the suggestopedia ($M = 44.63$) group did significantly worse than the standard DLIFLC ($M = 81.49$) group, $t(38) = -8.65$, $p<.001$. They also scored significantly lower than the flexibly-scheduled ($M = 80.87$) group, $t(27) = 6.79$, $p<.001$. There were no significant differences between the two DLIFLC groups, $t(27) = -0.14$, $p>.05$. Subsequent analyses of variance between sections on the written scores indicated no within group effect. Appendix B provides a sample of the written component of the achievement tests.

Oral Scores. The other main component of the achievement tests was the oral score. The ANOVA conducted on the three groups indicated a significant difference among groups, $F(2,46) = 11.43$, $p<.001$. T-tests indicated significantly lower scores for the suggestopedia ($M = 62.90$) group when compared to the standard DLIFLC ($M = 78.23$) group, $t(38) = 3.94$, $p<.001$. The suggestopedia group also scored significantly lower than the flexibly-scheduled ($M = 79.93$) group, $t(27) = 3.90$, $p<.01$. No differences were found between the DLIFLC groups, standard and flexibly-scheduled, $t(27) = 0.40$, $p>.05$. The analyses of variances for within group effect resulted in no significant differences. Appendix C provides a sample of the oral portion of the achievement tests.

Exam Average. The treatment effect was significant among groups, $F(2,46) = 41.50$, $p<.001$. Subsequent t-tests found that the suggestopedia ($M = 48.19$) group scored signficantly lower than the standard DLIFLC ($M = 80.83$) group, $t(38) = -7.96$, $p<.001$. The suggestopedia group also had significantly lower scores than the flexibly-scheduled ($M = 80.68$) group, $t(27) = 6.47$, $p<.001$. No significant difference was found between the standard DLIFLC and flexibly-scheduled groups, $t(27) = 0.973$, $p>.05$.

A further analysis of variance was conducted using Hartley's test to determine whether the variability of scores between sections may have caused group differences. There were no significant differences between the two sections of the standard DLIFLC control group, E and F, or between the two sections of the suggestopedia group, I and J.

The results in Table 1 reflect the significantly lower scores for the suggestopedia group as compared to the DLIFLC groups. Sections are listed for comparisons of similarity of scores within groups. The table also reflects the comparability between the DLIFLC groups (standard and flexibly-scheduled) on the weighted exam average.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Module Exam Averages by Section, and by Group

	M	SD
Section E (standard DLIFLC)	84.67	9.53
Section F (standard DLIFLC)	76.99	13.45
Standard DLIFLC group (avg. of sect. E and F)	80.83	12.01
Section I (suggestopedia)	45.62	10.22
Section J (suggestopedia)	50.76	16.90
Suggestopedia group (avg. of sect. I and J)	48.19	13.85
Flexibly-scheduled Group (one sect.)	80.68	8.55

Summary of Findings. The suggestopedia group scored significantly lower then the two DLIFLC groups on the written and oral components of the achievement tests. The results in Table 2 indicate that the greatest difference between the suggestopedia and DLIFLC groups was on the written portion of the achievement tests. This finding was expected, in part, because of the emphasis placed by the suggestopedia methodology on the oral component of language learning. The comparability of written and oral scores for both the standard DLIFLC and flexibly-scheduled groups reflects the intent of both methodologies to provide an instructional balance between the written and oral language skills.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Written and Oral Module Results by Section, and by Group

	Written Results		Oral Results	
	M	SD	M	SD
Section E	85.30	10.59	82.12	6.47
Section F	77.68	13.02	74.34	15.50
Standard DLIFLC gp.	81.49	12.19	78.23	12.23
Section I	41.92	10.63	60.80	9.72
Section J	47.33	18.00	64.99	14.84
suggestopedia gp.	44.63	14.66	62.90	12.40
Flexibly-scheduled group (one section)	80.87	9.28	79.93	5.82

Table 3 shows the results of the five achievement or module tests by component and exam average, and by group. It is interesting to note that the two DLIFLC groups had overall higher scores on the written measures as compared to the oral measures of achievement. Sugggestopedia results were the opposite, with higher oral than written scores which is again in consonance with their emphasis on the oral skills of language learning.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Module I-V Scores by Group

MOD Component(s)	Standard DLIFLC		Suggestopedia		Flexibly-Scheduled	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
MOD I written	84.85	12.93	52.85	14.38	86.89	6.45
oral	84.80	13.21	76.15	8.89	86.33	4.00
exam avg.	84.83	12.53	57.55	12.53	86.78	5.63
MOD II written	81.79	10.84	40.20	15.80	79.78	10.90
oral	78.21	8.99	66.95	14.76	81.33	7.62
exam avg.	81.09	9.97	45.55	15.11	80.09	9.73
MOD III written	83.95	8.50	44.32	15.51	80.89	10.47
oral	79.16	8.03	52.74	21.45	77.00	9.00
exam avg.	82.99	7.77	45.47	15.45	80.11	9.96
MOD IV written	80.84	10.66	44.95	15.71	70.56	11.18
oral	77.26	8.08	55.79	15.48	76.67	10.79
exam avg.	80.13	9.79	47.05	15.01	78.98	10.82
MOD V written	84.39	8.89	43.00	14.76	77.22	14.30
oral	81.33	7.87	61.53	18.33	78.33	4.92
exam avg.	83.78	8.31	46.74	14.56	77.44	12.10

Combined Achievement and Proficiency Measures

A second measure of academic performance used was the Proficiency Advancement Test (PAT) I. The PAT was a combined measure of both achievement and proficiency with emphasis on achievement. An analysis of variance was conducted to compare scores among groups on the three components of the PAT: listening, reading, and speaking. The suggestopedia group had significantly lower scores than the two DLIFLC groups on the reading and speaking components. There were no significant differences among the three groups on the listening co ponent. There were no significant differences between the DLIFLC groups on the three components.

Listening Scores. No significant difference was found among the suggestopedia (M = 58.46), standard DLIFLC (M = 66.23), and flexibly-scheduled (M = 63.73) groups.

Reading Scores. Significant differences were found on the reading scores among the three groups, $F(2,43) = 6.16$, $p<.01$. Subsequent analyses indicated a significant difference between the suggestopedia (M = 66.71) and standard DLIFLC (M = 73.47) groups, $t(35) = -2.93$, $p<.01$. A significant effect was also found between the suggestopedia and flexibly-scheduled (M = 75.10) groups, $t(26) = 2.71$, $p<.05$. No differences were found between the standard DLIFLC and flexibly-scheduled groups, $t(25) = 0.63$, $p>.05$.

An analysis of variance between the sections of the suggestopedia group indicated no significant differences. There were significant differences between section E (M = 77.06) and section F (M = 69.89) of the standard DLIFLC group $t(16) = -3.13$, $p<.01$. However, an analysis of variance for the groups within treatments design indicated that the sections did not significantly contribute to the variability between groups.

Speaking Scores The ANOVA found a significant effect among groups on the speaking scores of the PAT I, $F(2,43) = 7.63$, $p<.01$.

T-tests between groups found that the suggestopedia (M = .64) group scored significantly lower than the standard DLIFLC (M = .89) group, $t(35) = -3.77$, $p<.01$. Scores between the sections within each group were comparable. No significant differences were found between the suggestopedia and flexibly-scheduled (M = .79) groups, $t(26) = 1.71$, $p>.05$. Again there were no significant differences between the standard DLIFLC and flexibly-scheduled groups, $t(25) = 1.53$, $p>.05$.

The range of scores for the speaking results (0-1) and the oral interview scores (0-1) is provided in Appendix J along with the description for each range (level). Also provided in Appendix J is the rating expected for a language basic course graduate at the DLIFLC.

Proficiency Measure

Face-to-Face Oral Interview Scores. The oral interview was the third measure of academic performance. It is considered to be a measure of conversational proficiency only.

The analysis of variance of the oral interview scores indicated no differences among groups. These results indicate that the suggestopedia group had the same level of proficiency after week 10 that the DLIFLC groups had after 14 and 15 weeks of study.

Summary of Findings

As measures of proficiency were added to the tests of academic performance, differences between the suggestopedia and the DLIFLC groups were reduced. This is demonstrated by a comparison of differences between the suggestopedia and DLIFLC groups on the PAT results (listening, reading, speaking) and the similarity between groups on the results from the oral interviews as shown in Table 4. The reduction in differences between groups

as measures of proficiency were increased is further evidenced by a comparison of the scores from Table 4 with the achievement scores from Table 2. (However, the similarity of oral interview scores among groups is most probably attributable to the low level of proficiency attained after only ten or fifteen weeks of study as well as the earlier emphasis suggestopedia places upon proficiency as compared to the more gradual development of proficiency by the two DLIFLC methodologies.) Table 4 also reflects higher reading than listening scores for all three groups.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations of PAT Scores Listening, Reading, and Speaking), and Face-to-Face Oral Interview Scores by Group

	Standard DLIFLC		Suggestopedia		Flexibly-Scheduled	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Listening	66.23	8.57	58.46	11.44	63.73	9.82
Reading	73.47	5.99	66.71	7.89	75.10	7.11
Speaking	.894	.170	.637	.239	.789	.169
Oral Interview	.650	.165	.674	.262	.644	.167

Measures of Student Attitudes

Overall, the attitudinal instruments failed to discriminate among groups. Exceptions are noted in the following sections on the weekly attitude survey and end-of-course questionnaire. Results were generally positive across groups on each of the three attitude measurement instruments: weekly attitude survey, pre- and posttest questionnaire, and end-of-course questionnaire.

A Z score variable transformation of individual student scores was used to standardize results from the instruments with different observed scales. This procedure involved scales from the weekly attitude survey (weeks 1 thru 10), the posttest, and the end-of-course questionnaire. An analysis of variance found no significant differences between the suggestopedia and standard DLIFLC groups on a measure combining all attitudinal results, $F(1,38) = 0.45$, $p > .05$. An ANOVA which included the attitudinal measures available from the

flexibly-scheduled group (i.e., the posttest and end-of-course questionnaire) also resulted in no significant differences among groups, $F(2,46) = 0.64$, $p > .05$.

Weekly Attitude Surveys. A review of the results from the weekly attitude survey indicated no differences between the suggestopedia and standard DLIFLC groups for weeks one through ten on measures of student attitudes about themselves while in class, and student opinions about the class. There were no differences between the groups on student opinions about their instructor(s) for weeks five through ten. However, for weeks one through four student opinions from the suggestopedia group about their instructor(s) tended to be more positive than those from the standard DLIFLC group.

Pre- and Posttest Questionnaire. Results of t-tests found no significant differences between pre and posttest scores for either the suggestopedia or standard DLIFLC group. A comparison of posttest scores between the suggestopedia and standard DLIFLC groups also indicated no significant differences.

End-of-Course Questionnaire. The three groups were compared on results from four scales designed to measure attitudes toward key characteristics alleged to typify suggestopedia instruction: concentration, student-centeredness, method, and effort required. There were no differences among groups on the concentration, student-centeredness, and method scales. However, there was a difference among groups on the effort scale with the suggestopedia group indicating a lower level of effort required in their study of the target language than the (self-reported) effort required of the two DLIFLC groups. Results were comparable between the DLIFLC groups.

Two scales designed to measure anxiety were also evaluated for group differences. A (Russian) class anxiety scale showed no overall differences between groups. On a (Russian) language use anxiety scale, the suggestopedia group indicated greater confidence in their ability to use the Russian language than did the two DLIFLC groups.

There were no end-of-course differences among groups on scales measuring student attitudes toward learning Russian, motivational intensity, desire to learn Russian, attitudes toward their instructor(s), and attitudes toward their (Russian) course.

On the results from the scale measuring attitudes toward the course materials, the flexibly-scheduled and standard DLIFLC groups were more positive toward their course materials than the suggestopedia group.

Student Comments. The importance of the teacher was clearly demonstrated across groups by consistently positive student comments. Comments from week to week addressed the "friendly", "comfortable", and "positive" approach of the instructor(s). The instructor(s) were often singled out by name for praise by the students, "....was especially helpful on verbs", "....is never boring". During one period of instructor absence, the students noted that the quality of the substitute was much lower and they wished they had their instructor back as quickly as possible "so that we could learn more".

Student comments about the methodologies were also noteworthy. During the first four or five weeks student comments from the suggestopedia group were positive and included remarks such as, "I like it", "learning faster and with confidence", and "activities are creative and enjoyable". After the first four or five weeks the positive attitudes of the suggestopedia group were not as consistently high as they had been. Self-esteem began to diminish and students began to want more cousework structure. At weeks nine and ten of the study, when the suggestopedia group was completing their course of instruction, student comments became more concerned with their possible shortcomings in language skill areas such as "writing" and "grammar".

The standard DLIFLC group comments during the first several weeks were more oriented toward their initial discomfort with the intensity of the language training, they felt "nervous","uptight","flustered", and a dislike for the use of "too many instructors". As noted in the "Contrasts Between Methodologies" section, the suggestopedia group had one teacher per section whereas the standard DLIFLC sections used an average of four instructors per day with the primary instructor teaching three of the six hours. The flexibly-scheduled group, not addressed in this part of the report, used only two instructors in a team teaching approach.

During the course of the study the standard DLIFLC group became more "comfortable", "relaxed", and had more confidence in their instruction, as indicated through the students´ perception of their ability, and a more positive attitude toward their instructors. After the fourth or fifth week, comments centered around materials considered difficult for the students, such as "perfect and imperfect verbs".

As a target of opportunity not originally considered in the design of the study, the flexibly-scheduled group´s comments were only solicited after week ten. (It should be noted that their academic performance records were available and eventually used for evaluation in the study.) These comments were consistently positive for the five weeks they were measured, weeks 11 thru 15, especially toward their methodology and instructors. Representative comments consistently found among the ten students and across the five weeks were as follows:

> "I feel that working in a self-paced group has been an immense help to me and that because of the latitude given to the teachers in order to adopt [adapt] their lessons to us, that we were able to do better than we could have otherwise."
>
> "I´m very certain the best results in teaching us Russian is to keep us as a self-paced group and even change the rest of the department to that way of teaching. We´re more comfortable this way and our teachers know each of our weak points whereas a different teacher every hour won´t even know our names."
>
> "(.....) is one of the best teachers I have ever had, she always tries different methods to help us learn, and is never bored with teaching.

"(.....) is very good too and is very knowledgeable about the customs and country."

Summary of Findings. The results indicated that there were no attitudinal differences among groups, except as previously noted, during the first four weeks of attitudes about instructors on the weekly attitude survey, and on three scales used in the end-of-course questionnaire. The similarity of attitudes across groups may be a result of their military background and having the same daily military requirements. Differences among groups may also have been attenuated because of the similarities in methodologies among groups as discussed in the section titled, "Description of Instructional Treatments". The short timeframe of the study may have also precluded more differences from developing.

The positive attitudes across groups may have been a direct and/or latent result of the positive attitudes of the instructors. The instructors' attitudes may have been positive, in turn, not so much as an effect of their methodology but rather the special attention received from the administrative staff and outside observers. This special effect would be more likely sustained over the shorter 10-15 weeks of the study rather than the total 47 week course of instruction. Also, better instructors, who may naturally engender positive student attitudes, may have been selected to employ the various methodologies. The likelihood of positive instructor attitudes existing and affecting the students is enhanced by the fact that the suggestopedia and flexibly-scheduled instructors were also shareholders in the instruction because of their involvement in the creation and implementation of their respective methodology.

There were two points of particular interest regarding attitudes of the suggestopedia group. One was that the gradual shift away from the high positive attitudes encountered during the first four or five weeks may have been a result of instructor "burnout" with the suggestopedia methodology in an intensive learning environment, as well as a result of receiving low scores on the first achievement test. Student expectations of a more formal student-teacher relationship may have had an impact on their attitudes as a result of the actual more informal, relaxed, and positive approach of the instructor. As previously noted in the "Method" chapter, students in the suggestopedia group were told that grades acquired while in the experiment would not adversely effect promotion or class standing. However, it is uncertain what real effect this had on the students. The second point worth noting is that while suggestopedia student attitudes were not as uniformly positive during the later weeks of the study they did remain positive while receiving generally low academic performance scores. The standard DLIFLC and flexibly-scheduled groups had the same level of positive attitudes but also had generally higher academic performance scores.

The differences among groups at the end of the course may indicate that suggestopedia's emphasis on the oral skills does have a positive effect on students' comfort with oral communication while the positive attitudes of the DLIFLC groups may be tempered by their concerns with the other language skills (i.e., listening, reading, and speaking). The students' opinions from the suggestopedia group about the lack of effort required is most probably a result of no requirement to use textbooks and no homework requirements. This "lack of effort" perception needs to remain in context with their overall

poorer academic performance results as compared to results from the two other groups.

The more positive attitudes of the flexibly-scheduled and DLIFLC groups toward their course materials may be a result of the DLIFLC groups having take-home materials while the suggestopedia group had none.

DLIFLC Office of Organizational Effectiveness (OE) Assessment of Student Attitudes

An assessment was conducted on student attitudes and their impressions in the use of their respective methodologies. The format involved one or two interviewers for groups of students ranging from 5 to 12 students per group. The overall findings were as follows:

> Students experienced high energy and confidence at the beginning of the course [study]. As the course progressed and more material was presented, the confidence level rose to what might be called a "maintenance level" and seemed to sustain the student the remainder of the course [study].
>
> The major learning and pedagogical factors indicated that the course content and quality of instruction were considered to be excellent. The suggestopedia methodology was considered to be a useful means of [sic] a person to obtain a speaking/listening competency of a foreign language in a short period of time.
>
> The learning situation, e.g., music, soft chairs, and absence of distractions, was not reported by the students to have a direct effect on the enhancement of learning a foreign language.

These conclusions tend to support the findings stated for the attitudinal measurement instruments, especially those from the weekly attitude surveys. Further detail from this assessment may be found in a separate report by Edwards (1985).

DISCUSSION

Based upon results from the measures of academic performance, the suggestopedia methodology did not accelerate learning when compared to the two DLIFLC groups. In fact, the comparison of gains in language learning among groups found that those of the suggestopedia group were significantly smaller than those of the two DLIFLC groups. The results indicating a significant difference were from both the written and oral measures of the achievement tests, and on two of the three measures (reading and speaking) from the Proficiency Advancement Test (PAT).

Though the suggestopedia group had generally lower scores than the DLIFLC groups on the measures of academic performance, test results indicated that there were smaller differences between the suggestopedia and DLIfLC groups as measures of proficiency were added to the evaluation of student performance. This trend is noted by a review of the results from the PAT indicating less differences between the suggestopedia and DLIFLC groups than were found on results from the achievement tests. Additionally, the face-to-face oral interview findings, reflecting measures of proficiency only, showed no differences among groups. Therefore, the comparatively lower scores of suggestopedia found on achievement measures during the early stages of language learning when suggestopedia is emphasizing proficiency and the DLIFLC groups are emphasizing achievement is not surprising. However, it is important to note that evaluations of proficiency during the early stages of language learning may not be able to provide clear discriminations between methods of instruction because of the low level of proficiency available to the students.

The combination of findings from this study, (i.e., to include the positive student attitudes within the suggestopedia group despite low academic performance, and their confidence with using the target language), along with the research in related suggestopedia areas, indicate a potential use for at least some of the components found in the suggestopedia method. Examples of potentially useful components of suggestopedia include the following: the use of incidental learning as a teaching technique; the emphasis on relaxation and a positive attitude toward the target language; and the attempt to immerse the student into the target language.

If suggestopedia were to be used as some form of enrichment adjunct to the established DLIFLC or other military language training programs, it should probably be used from one to five weeks. This may be the best time interval since positive student attitudes and the instructor energy required to implement a suggestopedia program seemed to peak and then diminish after approximately five weeks of intensive application. The effect of instructor energy was reported by the suggestopedia instructors and noted in the Schleicher report previously cited. Those components listed in the previous paragraph that are found useful could be incorporated throughout a course of instruction.

The evaluation of the flexible-scheduling methodology indicates that there can be a time savings over a course of instruction by the instructor(s)' close monitoring and supervision of student progression through a curriculum. The

time saved may be used for review, for the presentation of new material, or for early advancement to additional training or a field assignment. Both the results from measures of academic performance and attitudes indicated that the positive findings from both measures were sustained over the course of the study. In fact, an informal follow-up evaluation of the flexibly-scheduled group, conducted approximately one month later (to determine whether the methodology should be continued throughout the 47-week course), indicated that they had maintained their high levels of performance and positive attitudes.

This report is based upon findings which are, in part, a result of a specific experimental design characterized by such elements as the time covered by the study, the population sampled, the sample size, differences in instructors, and the instruments employed. Conclusions drawn from this report should not be generalized outside the context of this study.

REFERENCES

Academic Policy and Standards. (1982). DLIFLC Pamphlet 350-10.

Bancroft, W.J. (1976). Suggestology and suggestopedia: The theory of the Lozanov method. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED132857)

Benitez-Bordon, R., & Schuster, D.H. (1976). The effects of a suggestive learning climate, synchronized breathing and music on the learning and retention of Spanish words. Journal of Suggestive-Accelerative Learning and Teaching, 1 (1), 27-40.

Bush, B.J. (1985). Optimizing the effectiveness of instructional strategies. Unpublished manuscript. Army Research Institute, Alexandria, VA.

Caskey, Owen L. (1980). Suggestive Accelerative Learning and Teaching. Instructional Design Library (Vol. 36). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications.

Center for Continuing Development. (1984). Acquisition through creative teaching, (ACT): The artful use of suggestion in foreign language instruction (the ACT approach). Sharon, MA: L. Dhority.

Chaney, D.S. & Andreasen, L. (1972, April). Relaxation and neuromuscular control and changes in mental performance under induced tension. Perceptual & Motor Skills, 34 (2), 677-678.

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center. (1983). DLIFLC Catalog of Instructional Materials (DLIFLC Pam 350-5 C1). Monterey, CA: Presidio of Monterey.

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center. (1982). ILR Handbook on Oral Interview Testing (DLIFLC Field Test Version DLI/LS Joint Oral Interview Transfer Project). Monterey, CA: Presidio of Monterey.

Edwards, L. (1985). Assessment of student attitudes and impressions in the use of suggestopedia in foreign language training: An evaluation. Unpublished manuscript. Office of Organizational Effectiveness, Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, Monterey, CA.

Gagne, R.M. & Dick, W. (1982). Instructional Psychology 1976-1981. (Contract No. N66001-81C-0456). San Diego, CA: US Navy Personnel Research and Development Center. (DLIFLC Document Reproduction Service No. 831129045).

Gardner, R. (1983). Learning another language: A true social psychological experiment. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 2 (2-4), 219-239.

Gardner, R.C., Clement, R., Smythe, P.C., & Smythe, C.L. (1979). Attitudes and motivation test battery, revised manual (Research Bulletin No. 15). London, Canada: University of Western Ontario, Department of Psychology.

Gardner, R.C., & Lalonde, R.N. (1983). The socio-educational model of second language acquisition: an investigation using LISREL causal modeling. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 2 (1), 1-15.

Gliksman, L., Smythe, P.C., & Gardner, R.C. (1982). The role of the integrative motive on students' participation in the French classroom. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 38 (4), 625-647.

Kurkov, M. (1977). Accelerated Learning: An experiment in the application of suggestopedia. Journal of Suggestive-Accelerative Learning and Teaching, 2 (1&2), 27-35.

Lipsitt, L.P., & Lolordo, V.M. (1963 August). Interactive effect of stress and stimulus generalization on children's oddity learning. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 66 (2), 210-214.

Lozanov, G. (1978). Suggestopedia. New York: Gordon and Breach.

Lozanov, G. (1975). Suggestopedia in primary schools. Suggestology and Suggestopedia, 1 (2), 1-14.

Lozanov Learning Systems, Inc. (1985). Final report for work performed under contract number DABT-60-84-R-0080. Silver Spring, MD: C. Schleicher.

Mankind Research Unlimited. (1974). Sandy Spring experiment: Applying relaxation techniques to education. Washington, D.C.: P. Kline.

Martin, D.J., & Schuster, D.H. (1977). The interaction of trait anxiety and muscle tension in learning. Journal of Suggestive-Accelerative Learning and Teaching, 2, 63-67.

Mignault, L.B. (1978). Suggestopedia: Is there a better way to learn? Canadian Modern Language Review, 34 (4), 695-701.

Racle, G. (1975). A suggestopedic experiment in Canada. Suggestology and Suggestopedia, 1 (2), 45-51.

Renard, R. (1976). A teaching experiment with the suggestopedic method. Review de Phonetique Appliquee, 38, 152-153. (From SSCI-Social Science citation index, 1978, 4112, Abstract No. 7803467)

Sanders, D., Eng R., & Murph, F. (1985). Statistics: a fresh approach (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Scovel, T. (1979). Review of Suggestology and outlines of Suggestopedy by George Lozanov. TESOL Quarterly, 13, 255-266.

Shitama, K. (1982, April). Evaluation of Lozanov Methodology. (Available from National Security Agency, Fort George G. Meade, MD. 20755)

Stein, B.L. (1982). The effect of an adaptation of the Lozanov method on vocabulary definition retention. (Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1982). Dissertation Abstract International, 43, 3573A.

Sterling, B. (1984). Suggestopedia in foreign language training at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Training (Contract No. DABT-60-84-R-0080). Indianapolis, IN: Soldier Support Center.

Straughan, J. & Dufort, W.H. (1969). Task difficulty, relaxation and anxiety level during verbal learning and recall. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 74, 621-624.

Strength Through Wisdom. (1979). Report of the President's commission on foreign language and international studies. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Tuckman, B.W. (1978). Conducting educational research (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanich, Inc.

Wagner, M.J., & Tilney, G. (1982). Superlearning. TESOL Quarterly, 23, 5-17.

Weinstein, C.E., & Mayer, R.E. (1985). The teaching of learning strategies. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching. New York: MacMillon.

APPENDIX A

WRITTEN COMPONENT (ACHIEVEMENT TESTS)

MODULE 1

PART 1	LISTENING COMPREHENSION
Stimulus	Twenty Russian sentences spoken on tape.
Task	Select correct translation of word or phrases in each sentence.
Options	Four English options.
Content	Vocabulary and grammar from Module 1.
No. of Items	20

PART II	DICTATION
Stimulus	Russian sentences spoken twice on tape.
Task	Write the words that have been omitted on student's sheet.
Content	Vocabulary and grammar from Module 1.
No. of Items	11

PART III	TRANSLATION
Stimulus	Written English sentences.
Task	Translate in writing each sentence into Russian. Use of lexical aids is not permitted.
Content	Vocabulary and grammar from Module 1.
No. of Items	10

MODULE II

PART I	DICTATION
Stimulus	Russian sentences spoken twice on tape.
Task	Write down the sentences in Russian.
Content	Vocabulary and grammar from Modules I and II (emphasis on Mod. II).
No. of Items	7

PART II	LISTENING COMPREHENSION
Stimulus	Two short Russian passages spoken on tape once.
Task	Answer in English in writing questions which are written in student's copy of the exam.
Content	Simple passages based on the vocabulary and grammar of Modules I and II (emphasis on Mod. II).
No. of Items	8

PART III	TRANSLATION
Stimulus	English sentences written on student's sheet.
Task	Translate in writing each sentence into Russian. Use of lexical aids is not permitted.
Content	Vocabulary and grammar from Modules I and II.
No. of Items	10

MODULE III

PART I	DICTATION
Stimulus	Russian sentences spoken twice on tape.
Task	Write down the sentences in Russian.
Content	Vocabulary and grammar from Modules I-III (emphasis on Mod. III).
No. of Items	10

PART II	LISTENING COMPREHENSION
Stimulus	Two short Russian passages spoken on tape once.
Task	Answer in English in writing questions which are written in student's copy of the exam.
Content	Simple passages based on the vocabulary and grammar of Modules I-III (emphasis on Mod. III).
No. of Items	9

PART III	TRANSLATION
Stimuli	English sentences written on student's sheet.
Task	Translate in writing each sentence into Russian. Use of lexical aids is not permitted.
Content	Vocabulary and grammar from Modules I-III (emphasis on Mod. III).
No. of Items	9

PART I	DICTATION
Stimulus	Russian sentences spoken twice on tape.
Task	Write down the sentences in Russian.
Content	Vocabulary and grammar from Modules I-IV (emphasis on Mod. IV).
No. of Items	10

PART II	LISTENING COMPREHENSION
Stimulus	Two short Russian passages spoken on tape once.
Task	Answer in English in writing questions which are written in student's copy of the exam.
Content	Simple passages based on the vocabulary and grammar of Modules I-IV (emphasis on Mod. IV).
No. of Items	7

PART III	FILL-INS
Stimulus	English words in Russian sentences.
Task	Translate in writing each word into Russian. Use of lexical aids is not permitted.
Content	Vocabulary and grammar from Module IV.
No. of Items	12

PART IV	TRANSLATION
Stimulus	Written English sentences.
Task	Translate in writing each sentence into Russian. Use of lexical aids is not permitted.
Content	Vocabulary and grammar from Modules I-IV (emphasis on Mod. IV).
No. of Items	10

MODULE V

PART I	DICTATION
Stimulus	Russian sentences spoken twice on tape.
Task	Write down the sentences in Russian.
Content	Vocabulary and grammar from Modules I-V (emphasis on Mod V).
No. of Items	6

PART II	LISTENING COMPREHENSION
Stimulus	Short statements in Russian spoken on tape.
Task	Select appropriate response to fit the situation.
Options	Three English options.
Content	Simple situations involving statements based on Modules I-V (emphasis on Mod. V).
No. of Items	5

PART III	FILL-INS
Stimulus	English words in Russian sentences.
Task	Translate in writing each word into Russian. Use of lexical aids is not permitted.
Content	Vocabulary and grammar from Module V.
No. of Items	8

PART IV	TRANSLATION
Stimulus	Written English sentences.
Task	Translate in writing each sentence into Russian. Use of lexical aids is not permitted.
Content	Vocabulary and grammar from Modules I-V (emphasis on Mod. V).
No. of Items	9

APPENDIX B

ORAL COMPONENT (ACHIEVEMENT TESTS)

MODULE 1

PART I	**READING**
Stimulus	Short passage in Russian (35 words).
Task	Read the text aloud.
Content	Simple Russian text based on the familiar and unfamiliar vocabulary.
No. of Items	1

PART II **SPEAKING**

Ten information questions asked in Russian by the instructor.
The questions are based on the material from Module 1.

MODULE II

PART I READING

Stimulus	Short passage in Russian (about 40 words).
Task	Read the text aloud.
Content	Simple Russian text based on familiar and unfamiliar vocabulary.
No. of Items	1

PART II QUESTIONS

Ten information questions asked in Russian by the instructor.
The questions are based on the material from Module II.

PART III TASK

One task written in English to elicit an oral response based on the material of Module II.

MODULE III

PART I QUESTIONS

Ten information questions asked in Russian by the instructor.
The questions are based on the material from Module III.

PART II TASKS

Two role-playing situations written in English to elicit an oral response based on the material of Module III.

MODULE IV

PART I QUESTIONS

Ten information questions asked in Russian by the instructor.
The questions are based on the material from Module IV.

PART II TASK

One task written in English to elicit an oral response based on the material of Module IV.

MODULE V

PART I QUESTIONS

Ten information questions asked in Russian by the instructor.
The questions are based on the material from Module V.

PART II TASK

One role-playing situation written in English to elicit an oral response based on the material of Module V.

APPENDIX C

LISTENING COMPREHENSION, PROFICIENCY ADVANCEMENT TEST (I)

1. PART ONE (WORDS AND PHRASES)

   Stimulus - Sentences/phrases spoken on tape.
   Task - Select correct translation of word or phrases in each level.
   Options - Four English options.
   Content - Familiar high frequency expressions, frozen phrases.
   No. of Items - 25
   Level - 0+/1

2. PART TWO (SITUATIONAL RESPONSE)

   Stimulus - Sentences spoken on tape.
   Task - Select appropriate response to fit situation.
   Options - Four target language options.
   Content - Simple situations involving very simple statements and responses.
   No. of Items - 15
   Level - 0+/1

3. PART THREE (GISTING/SHORT PASSAGE)

   Stimulus - Sentences or short paragraphs spoken on tape twice.
   Task - Select correct summary of passage.
   Options - Four English options.
   Content - Simple passages reduced to Level 1+/2 wording.
   Words in multiple choice options will help furnish context; glosses in English may be used if absolutely necessary.
   No. of Items - 15
   Level - 1+/2

4. PART FOUR (FACTUAL QUESTIONS/LONGER PASSAGES)

   Stimulus - Four or five passages (50-70 words) spoken on tape twice.
   Task - Answer six or seven factural multiple-choice items on each passage.
   Options - Four English options.
   Content - Simple passages reduced to Level 2 wording with very minor editing; words in multiple choice options will help furnish context; glosses may be used if absolutely necessary.
   No. of Items - 23-30
   Level - 2

   Total No. of Items - 85
   Range - 0+/2

APPENDIX D

READING COMPREHENSION, PROFICIENCY ADVANCEMENT TEST (I)

1. PART ONE - (SIGNS AND EXPRESSIONS)

   Stimulus - Printed signs, frozen/memorized phrases.
   Options - Four English options.
   Number of Items - 10
   Level - 0+

2. PART TWO (VOCABULARY IN CONTEXT)

   Stimulus - Short printed sentences with underlined word.
   Task - Choose translation of underlined words.
   Options - Four English options.
   Context - High frequency/familiar vocabulary in familiar context.
   No. of Items - 15
   Level - 0+/1

3. PART THREE (CONTEXTUAL COMPREHENSION)

   Stimulus - Four short sentences or paragraphs with blanks.
   Task - Choose correct form to fill blank.
   Options - Four target language options.
   Content - High frequency/familiar grammar patterns and forms.
   No. of Items - 15
   Level - 0+/1

4. PART FOUR (QUESTIONS ON PASSAGE/GISTING)

   Stimulus - Two/three short passages (45-70 words).
   Task - Answer multiple-choice questions (factual summary).
   Options - Four English options.
   Content - Authentic* passages reduced to Level 1+/2 wording.
   Multiple-choice options will help furnish context: glosses in English may be used if absolutely necessary to furnish context.
   No. of Items - 12
   Level - 1/1+

*(In these documents the word "authentic" refers to published written material in the target language outside the course of instruction.)

5. PART FIVE (CLOZE PASSAGE)

Stimulus - Short passage (80-120 words) with paraphrase.
Task - Select options to restore passage.
Options - 3-4 symbols, 12-16 deletions, 10-15 options under each symbol.
Content - Simple authentic passage with very little editing; paraphrase will be used to furnish context.
Glosses in English may be used if absolutely necessary to furnish context.
No. of Items - 16
Level - 1+/2

6. PART SIX (INFORMATION IDENTIFICATION)

Stimulus - Short passage (125-150 words) with underlined words and phrases.
Task - Select multiple-choice option that translates underlined portion.
Options - 4 multiple-choice.
Content - Simple authentic passage with very little editing; glosses in English may be used if absolutely necessary to furnish context.
No. of Items - 17
Level - 1+/2

Total No. of Items - 85
Level Range - 0+/2

APPENDIX E

SPEAKING COMPONENT, PROFICIENCY ADVANCEMENT TEST (I)

1. PART ONE

   Three information questions designed to elicit speech at levels 0+ through 1.

2. PART TWO

   Two role-playing situations designed to elicit speech at levels 0+ through 1.

APPENDIX F

WEEKLY ATTITUDE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

name

SSAN

Privacy Act Statement

You are being asked to complete this questionnaire as part of a research effort which seeks to find ways of improving both teaching and learning at DLIFLC. Disclosure of requested information is solicited under the authority of Title 10, United States Code 3012, Executive Order 9397, and Army Regulation 600-2, and is voluntary. Failure to provide name or SSAN may result in misidentification and thus jeopardize the findings and conclusions of this study, with possible negative impact on the Defense Foreign Language Program as a whole.

Your answers to all questions will be held in strict confidence, and your name and SSAN are requested only so that your answers can be associated with other information that is essential to this research effort and is contained in your official records and training files. Neither your instructors nor your superior officers nor anyone else other than the researchers will be able to associate your identity with your responses on this questionnaire, and even the researchers will use assigned numbers to refer to your questionnaire data and to all other information that is collected as part of this research. Student responses will be reported only as aggregates (e.g., "20% of the students thought that....") or as anonymous individuals (e.g., "one student commented that....).

In order for the results to be meaningful, it is important that your answers be accurate and frank as possible. Also, the usefulness of your questionnaire will be lessened to the extent that you do not answer each item. Therefore, you are urged to answer all items unless it is very important to you personally to omit certain ones, in which case you may omit them and go on to the others. If you have questions about any items, please raise your hand for assistance.

From previous experience and research we know that students' feelings and reactions to a class and to instructors change over time. We would like to know how your feelings change as this class progresses. We will ask you to respond to the items on the next page each week. Only the researchers will have access to this information; it will not be used as any part of the official performance appraisal of your instructors. So please be completely frank and honest in your responses knowing that strict confidentiality will be maintained.

For each pair of words place an "x" in the space that best reflects what you feel and how strongly you feel about the idea conveyed by each word-pair.

Using the word-pairs below, describe your actual feelings while in this class (that is, describe yourself while in class) during the past week:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
comfortable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	uncomfortable
attentive	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	restless
uncertain	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	confident
positive	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	negative
relaxed	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	uptight
trusting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	guarded
bored	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	stimulated
insignificant	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	significant
happy	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unhappy
calm	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	flustered
smart	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	stupid
depressed	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	excited

Use the following set of word-pairs to describe your opinions <u>about the class</u> during the past week.

liked	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	disliked
interested	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	bored
easy	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	hard
dreaded	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	enjoyed
tedious	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	fascinating
positive	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	negative

Use the following word-pairs to describe your opinions about your instructor(s) during the past week.

competent	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	incompetent
caring	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	insensitive
unsure	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	confident
dull	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	exciting
uncomfortable	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	relaxed
creative	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	uncreative

Any other comments you would like to make?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX G

PRETEST AND POSTTEST QUESTIONNAIRE

_____ name

_____ SSAN

Privacy Act Statement

You are being asked to complete this questionnaire as part of a research effort which seeks to find ways of improving both teaching and learning at DLIFLC. Disclosure of requested information is solicited under the authority of Title 10, United States Code 3012, Executive Order 9397, and Army Regulation 600-2, and is voluntary. Failure to provide name or SSAN may result in misidentification and thus jeopardize the findings and conclusions of this study, with possible negative impact on the Defense Foreign Language Program as a whole.

Your answers to all questions will be held in strict confidence, and your name and SSAN are requested only so that your answers can be associated with other information that is essential to this research effort and is contained in your official records and training files. Neither your instructors nor your superior officers nor anyone else other than the researchers will be able to associate your identity with your responses on this questionnaire, and even the researchers will use assigned numbers to refer to your questionnaire data and to all other information that is collected as part of this research. Student responses will be reported only as aggregates (e.g., "20% of the students thought that....") or as anonymous individuals (e.g., "one student commented that....").

In order for the results to be meaningful, it is important that your answers be accurate and frank as possible. Also, the usefulness of your questionnaire will be lessened to the extent that you do not answer each item. Therefore, you are urged to answer all items unless it is very important to you personally to omit certain ones, in which case you may omit them and go on to the others. If you have questions about any items, please raise your hand for assistance.

PART A

The following statements are about potential advantages of learning Russian. However, you may not agree that a given statement has any relevance to you personally. For example:

> "I like having the opportunity to learn Russian because I will be able to read Russian literature in the original."

If reading Russian literature is totally irrelevant to you, and you can't imagine why anyone would want to, you would write 1 for strongly disagree. On the other hand if reading Russian literature in the original is one of your most important reasons for learning Russian, you would write 6 for strongly agree. Of course, your response to this statement may lie somewhere between those two extremes; in that case, you would write 2, 3, 4, or 5.

Agree Strongly	Agree Moderately	Agree Slightly	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Moderately	Disagree Strongly
6	5	4	3	2	1

I like having the opportunity to learn Russian because it will....

_____ 1. help me get a job after I have completed my military service.

_____ 2. increase my ability to influence others.

_____ 3. enable me to better understand Russian culture.

_____ 4. make me a better educated person.

_____ 5. give me an edge in competing with others.

_____ 6. advance my military career.

_____ 7. enable me to get to know Russians.

_____ 8. help me understand what Russians really want.

_____ 9. make me appear more cultured.

_____ 10. enable me to meet and converse with a greater variety of people.

_____ 11. help me earn a college degree.

_____ 12. enable me to interact socially with Russians.

_____ 13. help me get the kind of job I want in the military.

_____ 14. help me protect my interests in dealing with Russians.

_____ 15. help me qualify for additional training in the military.

_____ 16. make me more attractive to future employers.

PART B

This part of the questionnaire asks you to indicate how much you agree or disagree with a series of statements about foreign languages in general. Your opinions or feelings may lead you to agree with some statements and disagree with others. There are no right or wrong answers--just your point of view.

REMEMBER:
1. It is your honest opinion that is being requested, and your responses will be treated with strict confidentiality.
2. Mark each statement according to your first impression; it is not necessary to take a lot of time for any one question.

Please read each statement carefully and write in the number that best describes your response.

Agree Strongly	Agree Moderately	Agree Slightly	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Moderately	Disagree Strongly
6	5	4	3	2	1

_____ 1. I would really like to learn many languages.

_____ 2. When I see a foreign film, I would rather hear the sound track in English than to hear the original language and see English subtitles.

_____ 3. Foreign languages sound like gibberish to me.

_____ 4. Knowing foreign languages can help one convey many feelings and ideas that are not easily expressed in English.

_____ 5. I wish I could speak several languages fluently.

_____ 6. If I planned to live in another country, and I thought I could get along in English, I would not make such effort to learn the language.

_____ 7. I really have little interest in foreign languages.

_____ 8. I often wish I could read newspapers and magazines in many languages.

_____ 9. I enjoy meeting and listening to people who speak other languages.

_____ 10. Studying a foreign language is not a pleasant experience.

NAME _____

DATE _____

APPENDIX H

END-OF-COURSE QUESTIONNAIRE

Now that the methods comparison experiment in which you have been participating has come to a close, we would like to ask you to help us evaluate it.

You are being asked to complete this questionnaire as part of a research effort which seeks to find ways to improving both teaching and learning here at DLI. Your answers to all questions will be treated in strict confidence. We ask for your name only to associate your responses on this questionnaire with other information of importance to our research. We will immediately assign numbers to your questionnaire and all other information we collect and only the numbers will be used in our analysis. Neither your instructors nor anyone else at DLI or in the military will have access to any of these questionnaire responses except as aggregated in research findings (e.g., "20% of the students felt that....). The researchers will be the only persons who will see the questionnaire with your name on it.

For the results to be meaningful, it is important that you be as accurate and as frank as possible in your answers. If you do not want to answer any particular item, you do not have to. However, you should realize that the usefulness of your questionnaire will be lessened to the extent that you do not answer each item. We, therefore, urge you to answer all items unless it is important to you personally to omit certain ones. If you have difficulties or questions about any one of the items, please raise your hand and someone will come to your assistance.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Section I

For each of the following statements, indicate the number from the following scale which best represents your reaction to the statement.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree	Agree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	6

_____ 1. I enjoyed participating in class.

_____ 2. I found that the course required extraordinary effort on my part.

_____ 3. My mind often wandered when I was in class.

_____ 4. If I had it to do over again, I would avoid studying Russian.

_____ 5. I did not get anxious when I had to respond in class.

_____ 6. I would feel calm and sure of myself if I had to order a meal in Russian.

_____ 7. I would have preferred another method of teaching this course.

_____ 8. I often felt uncomfortable in class.

_____ 9. If ever I should run into a group of people speaking Russian, I would feel relaxed in joining them.

_____ 10. I found the instructors responsive to my particular learning needs.

_____ 11. Most things we learn in Russian are interesting.

_____ 12. I really couldn't understand people who got uptight about using Russian in class.

_____ 13. It was easy to remain attentive in this class.

_____ 14. So far, I have found this program easier than I expected.

_____ 15. I really enjoy learning Russian.

_____ 16. I would feel uncomfortable speaking Russian in any real-world situation.

_____ 17. My instructor(s) seemed genuinely interested in my progress in this course.

_____ 18. I never felt quite sure of myself when I was speaking in class.

_____ 19. I learn more when other teaching methods are used.

_____ 20. In all honesty, I would rather do almost anything that study Russian.

_____ 21. This was one of the most demanding courses I have ever taken.

_____ 22. I felt confident when active participation took place in class.

_____ 23. I would feel comfortable speaking Russian in an informal gathering where both English and Russian speaking persons were present.

_____ 24. I plan to continue my study of Russian after I complete this course.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree	Agree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	6

_____ 25. When in class, I was completely absorbed in what was going on in the classroom.

_____ 26. To be honest, I hate Russian.

_____ 27. My instructors were adequately sensitive to the problems of a beginning student.

_____ 28. I often dreaded going to class.

_____ 29. I am sure I would get nervous if I had to speak Russian to a sales clerk.

_____ 30. Learning Russian takes so long, the attempt does not seem worthwhile.

_____ 31. It embarrassed me to volunteer answers in class.

_____ 32. I usually had plenty of time to complete all class assignments.

_____ 33. I would feel confident and relaxed if I had to ask street directions in Russian.

_____ 34. I am glad to have the opportunity to learn Russian.

_____ 35. My instructor(s) seemed determined to cover specified material regardless of student readiness.

_____ 36. I often had difficulty keeping my attention focused on classroom activities.

_____ 37. I think learning Russian is boring.

_____ 38. It bothered me that the other students spoke Russian in class better than I did.

_____ 39. I would get flustered if it were necessary to speak Russian when making a telephone call.

_____ 40. I would recommend that this course always be taught using this method.

_____ 41. Making a hotel reservation in Russian would bother me.

_____ 42. The satisfaction of learning Russian makes the effort worthwhile.

_____ 43. I was generally relaxed in class.

_____ 44. This course seemed better geared to the way I learn than other courses I have taken.

Section II

Please answer each of the following items by circling the letter of the completion which appears to be most applicable to you. Please be as frank and accurate as possible; the proper evaluation of this experiment depends upon it.

45. During off-duty hours, I thought about what I had learned in my Russian class....

    a. very frequently
    b. seldom or never
    c. once in a while

46. When I had a problem understanding something we were learning in Russian class, I would usually....

    a. ask the instructor for help
    b. seek help only just before the exam
    c. just forget about it

47. When working on assignments, I usually....

    a. put some effort into them, but not as much as I could
    b. worked very carefully, making sure I understand everything
    c. did as little as possible
    d. [Not applicable--we had no assignments.]

48. Considering how I studied Russian, I can honestly say that I....

    a. did as much work as the next person
    b. will pass on the basis of sheer luck or intelligence, because I did very little work
    c. worked very hard to learn Russian
    d. [Not applicable--we were not required to study outside of class.]

49. If my instructor wanted someone to do an extra Russian assignment, I would....

    a. definitely not volunteer
    b. definitely volunteer
    c. do it only if the instructor asked me directly
    d. [Not applicable--we had no assignments.]

50. After I got my Russian assignments back, I usually....

    a. reviewed them, correcting my mistakes
    b. just put them aside and went on
    c. looked them over, but didn't bother correcting mistakes
    d. [Not applicable--we had no assignments.]

51. When I was in Russian class, I....

    a. volunteered answers as much as possible
    b. answered only the easier questions
    c. hardly ever said anything

52. When there was an event involving Russian language or culture, I usually went....

    a. even if I had to pay
    b. only if it was free or subsidized
    c. only if required to do so

53. I made a point of talking to my instructors outside of class....

a. only if I was having difficulty understanding something
b. to learn as much as I could
c. not at all

54. I used the Russian materials in the Learning Resources Center (films, tapes, etc.)....

a. regularly
b. seldom or never
c. once in a while

55. If I thought by staying in the military I had a good chance to take intermediate and advanced Russian....

a. I would definitely go for it
b. it would make no difference in my plans
c. I would get out as soon as possible

56. I want to learn enough Russian....

a. to get through the course
b. to be really fluent
c. to do my job satisfactorily

57. The amount of Russian I have learned so far....

a. is enough to turn me off completely
b. is satisfactory; I can get by with it
c. has just whetted my appetite for more

58. The further along I go in my Russian studies, the more I....

a. wish I had started long ago
b. want to keep on going with it
c. wish it were all over

59. During Russian class, I would like....

a. to have a combination of Russian and English spoken
b. to have as much English as possible spoken
c. to have only Russian spoken

60. If I had the opportunity to speak Russian outside of class, I would....

a. never speak it
b. speak Russian most of the time, using English only if really necessary
c. speak it occasionally

61. If it were strictly up to me whether or not to learn Russian, I....

a. would definitely take it
b. would not take it
c. don't know whether I would take it or not

62. I find studying Russian....

a. not interesting at all
b. as interesting as most other subjects I've studied
c. especially interesting

63. If I had the opportunity I would watch Russian TV and listen to Russian radio....

a. sometimes
b. as often as possible
c. never

64. If they were available, I would read Russian magazines and newspapers....

a. as often as I could
b. seldom or never
c. not very often

Section III

The scales that follow attempt to capture your overall impressions of the instructors, course materials, and course in general, to which you have just been exposed. You will be asked to rate each of these three things on a series of scales, each of which consists of a pair of words expressing opposites with seven spaces in between. For example, assume you are rating the course on this scale:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
hard	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	easy

If you place an "x" in the "1" position, it means that you found this course to be extremely hard; an "x" in the "7" position would mean you found it extremely easy. Positions 2-3 and 5-6 are used to indicate gradations of these opinions, and position 4 indicates that you found the course neither hard nor easy, but somewhere in the "average" range.

In answering this part of the questionnaire, please work quickly and do not stop to think about each scale. It is your immediate impressions in which we are interested.

A. INSTRUCTOR(S)

For each pair of words on this scale, place an "x" in the position which best fits your impression of your primary instructor(s).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
efficient	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	inefficient
insensitive	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	sensitive
cheerful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	cheerless
competent	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	incompetent
insincere	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	sincere
unapproachable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	approachable
pleasant	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unpleasant
trusting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	suspicious
incapable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	capable
tedious	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	fascinating

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
friendly	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unfriendly
exciting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	dull
organized	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	disorganized
unreliable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	reliable
unimaginative	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	imaginative
impatient	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	patient
polite	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	impolite
colorful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	colorless
unintelligent	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	intelligent
good	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	bad
industrious	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unindustrious
boring	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	interesting
dependable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	undependable
disinterested	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	interested
inconsiderate	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	considerate

B. COURSE MATERIALS

For each pair of words on this scale, place an "x" in the position which best fits your impression of the course materials you used.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
important	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unimportant
meaningless	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	meaningful
dull	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	stimulating
interesting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	boring
organized	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	disorganized
valuable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	worthless
confusing	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	coherent
hard	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	easy
natural	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	artificial
irrelevant	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	relevant
clear	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unintelligible
useful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	useless

For each pair of words on this scale, place an "x" in the position which best fits your impression of the course as a whole as you experienced it during the weeks in which the experiment was in progress.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
meaningful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	meaningless
enjoyable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unenjoyable
monotonous	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	absorbing
effortless	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	hard
awful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	nice
interesting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	boring
good	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	bad
simple	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	complicated
disagreeable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	agreeable
fascinating	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	tedious
worthless	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	valuable
necessary	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unnecessary
appealing	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unappealing
useless	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	useful
elementary	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	complex
pleasurable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	painful
educational	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	noneducational
unrewarding	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	rewarding
difficult	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	easy
satisfying	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unsatisfying
unimportant	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	important
pleasant	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unpleasant
exciting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	dull
clear	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	confusing
colorful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	colorless

THANK YOU FOR ALL YOUR COOPERATION!

APPENDIX I

SCRIPT FOR STUDENT ORIENTATION ON EXPERIMENT

Some of you may wonder how a particular method of teaching or training is approved and authorized. Since DLI is responsible for conducting language training, developing course materials for use here and in the field, developing tests for use here and throughout DOD (proficiency tests and aptitude tests—DLPT/DLAB), for language training standards and for research in Foreign Language (FL) training, we constantly need to evaluate these efforts and attempt to improve them.

Newly developed materials and tests, for example, are validated by actually using them with student groups, then by analyzing and studying the results. Subsequently, any revisions which may be needed are made in an effort to continue improving our courses and the general training provided at DLIFLC. We also ask students for their opinions and attitudes at various time through questionnaires and interviews. All this is again part of our continuing effort to provide the best language training possible for DLI students.

The DLI staff, in cooperation with the Army Soldier Support Center and the Army Research Institute, has a plan to try out two kinds of methods of teaching Russian with your class. We plan to try these out with four of the sections of this class. With 10 students per sections, we will use method "A" in two sections for a total of 20 students. With two other sections or a total of 20 students, we will use method "B". This study will only last during the first term of the Basic Course or approximately 15 weeks. At that time a Proficiency Advancement Test (PAT I) is given to all students anyway. All students are expected to pass PAT I before moving on to Term II.

Both groups will cover essentially the same amount of material that is covered by all students in Term I of the Basic Course, except that there will be differences in what goes on in the classroom. The learning and teaching in two of these sections using method "A" will be somewhat different than the learning and teaching in the two sections normally used in DLI classes. Two other sections will follow the normal DLI pattern of teaching and learning (Method "B") except that records kept on all four groups will be analyzed and compared in much more detail. Also, there may be somewhat more attention given to observations of the classroom activities and to the progress individual students are making. There will not be any extra work of any kind, so the same amount of effort will be expected anyway for students in all sections.

The Army is fully behind this study and expects service members to apply themselves by learning Russian as their basic duty regardless of which section they may be assigned to. Normal assignments to sections in DLI Basic Courses is controlled by the language department chairpersons and their supervisors. We do not make up sections artificially by putting all the people with high scores on tests such as DLAB and/or ASVAB in one section and all the low scorers in another. Rather we normally seek balanced grouping in all sections, so there is no special advantage in being in one section over being

in another one. For example, we prefer to have the same ratio of males and females in all sections.

Once you are assigned to one of these four sections, you are expected to remain in it just as all students assigned to any sections are expected to remain with their section until such time as there may be an administrative reason for recombining sections. This would not normally happen until after 15 weeks anyway. We assume that you will put your best efforts into learning Russian regardless of which section you are assigned to and without favor to one supervisor over another or one set of instructors over another.

You should be aware that proponents for method "A" claim that people learn much faster when it is used. This is not necessarily unusual, since proponents for innovative methods almost always make such claims. DLI's purpose is to give a fair chance for method "A" to be fully evaluated in comparison with DLI's standard method of teaching. Incidentally, DLI's standard method also has many innovative features, especially since the entire course, including materials and tests, is quite new and is still subject to some revision. So just consider that the normal mode for all DLI sections is not cast in concrete but rather is still open to change as we never stop seeking to improve all of our training materials and methods so that our students can learn more effectively and efficiently.

If any of you think you will feel uncomfortable by being in one of the four sections destined to be given more evaluation, please say so now. Once we make assignments to sections we do not expect to make changes.

Are there any questions?

APPENDIX J

DESCRIPTIONS AND RATINGS

Table J-1. Ratings for the Speaking Portion of the PAT, and for the (Face-to-Face) Oral Interviews

	Raw		Converted
Range of the results from the experiment	0	low	0.0
		=	0.2
		high	0.4
	0+	low	0.6
		=	0.7
		high	0.8
	1	low	1.0
		=	1.2
		high	1.4
Level expected for the Russian Basic Course (RBC) graduate after 47 wks	1+	low	1.6
		=	1.7
		high	1.8
	2	low	2.0
		=	2.2
		high	2.4
	2+	low	2.6
		=	2.7
		high	2.8
	3	low	3.0
		=	3.2
		high	3.4
	3+	low	3.6
		=	3.7
		high	3.8
	4	low	4.0
		=	4.2
		high	4.4
	4+	low	4.6
		=	4.7
		high	4.8
	5	low	5.0
		=	5.2

INTERAGENCY LANGUAGE ROUNDTABLE
LANGUAGE SKILL LEVEL DESCRIPTIONS
FOR SPEAKING (PAT) AND ORAL INTERVIEW RATINGS

Preface

The following proficiency level descriptions characterize spoken language use. Each of the six "base levels" (coded 00, 10, 20, 30, 40, and 50) implies control of any previous "base level's" functions and accuracy. The "plus level" designation (coded 06, 16, 26, etc.) will be assigned when proficiency substantially exceeds one base skill level and does not fully meet the criteria for the next "base level." The "plus level" descriptions are therefore supplementary to the "base level" descriptions.

A skill level is assigned to a person through an authorized language examination. Examiners assign a level on a variety of performance criteria exemplified in the descriptive statements. Therefore, the examples given here illustrate, but do not exhaustively describe, either the skills a person may possess or situations in which he/she may function effectively.

Statements describing accuracy refer to typical stages in the development of competence in the most commonly taught languages in formal training programs. In other languages, emerging competence parallels these characterizations, but often with different details.

Unless otherwise specified, the term "native speaker" refers to native speakers of a standard dialect.

"Well-educated," in the context of these proficiency descriptions, does not necessarily imply formal higher education. However, in cultures where formal higher education is common, the language-use abilities of persons who have had such education is considered the standard. That is, such a person meets contemporary expectations for the formal, careful style of the language, as well as a range of less formal varieties of the language.

Level 0 (No Proficiency)

Unable to function in the spoken language. Oral production is limited to occasional isolated words. Has essentially no communicative ability. (Has been coded S-0 in some nonautomated applications.) [Computer Code 00]

Level 0+ (Memorized Proficiency)

Able to satisfy immediate needs using rehearsed utterances. Shows little real autonomy of expression, flexibility, or spontaneity. Can ask questions or make statements with reasonable accuracy only with memorized utterances or formulae. Attempts at creating speech are usually unsuccessful.

Examples: The individual's vocabulary is usually limited to areas of immediate survival needs. Most utterances are telegraphic; that is, functors (linking words, markers, and the like) are omitted, confused, or distorted. An individual can usually differentiate most significant sounds when produced in isolation, but, when combined in words or groups of words, errors may be frequent. Even with repetition, communication is severely limited even with people used to dealing with foreigners. Stress, intonation, tone, etc. are usually quite faulty. (Has been coded S-0+ in some nonautomated applications.) [Computer Code 06]

Level 1 (Elementary Proficiency)

Able to satisfy minimum courtesy requirements and maintain very simple face-to-face conversations on familiar topics. A native speaker must often use slowed speech, repetition, paraphrase, or a combination of these to be understood by this individual. Similarly, the native speaker must strain and employ real-world knowledge to understand even simple statements/questions from this individual. This speaker has a functional, but limited proficiency. Misunderstandings are frequent, but the individual is able to ask for help and to verify comprehension of native speech in face-to-face interaction. The individual is unable to produce continuous discourse except with rehearsed material.

Examples: Structural accuracy is likely to be random or severely limited. Time concepts are vague. Vocabulary is inaccurate, and its range is very narrow. The individual often speaks with great difficulty. By repeating, such speakers can make themselves understood to native speakers who are in regular contact with foreigners but there is little precision in the information conveyed. Needs, experience, or training may vary greatly from individual to individual; for example, speakers at this level may have encountered quite different vocabulary areas. However, the individual can typically satisfy predictable, simple, personal and accommodation needs; can generally meet courtesy, introduction, and identification requirements; exchange greetings; elicit and provide, for example, predictable and skeletal biographical information. He/she might give information about

business hours, explain routine procedures in a limited way, and state in a simple manner what actions will be taken. He/she is able to formulate some questions even in languages with complicated question constructions. Almost every utterance may be characterized by structural errors and errors in basic grammatical relations. Vocabulary is extremely limited and characteristically does not include modifiers. Pronunciation, stress, and intonation are generally poor, often heavily influenced by another language. Use of structure and vocabulary is highly imprecise. (Has been coded S-1 in some nonautomated applications.) [Computer Code 10]

Level 1+ (Elementary Proficiency, Plus)

Can initiate and maintain predictable face-to-face conversations and satisfy limited social demands. He/she may, however, have little understanding of the social conventions of conversation. The interlocutor is generally required to strain and employ real-world knowledge to understand even some simple speech. The speaker at this level may hesitate and may have to change subjects due to lack of language resources. Range and control of the language are limited. Speech largely consists of a series of short, discrete utterances.

Examples: The individual is able to satisfy most travel and accommodation needs and a limited range of social demands beyond exchange of skeletal biographic information. Speaking ability may extend beyond immediate survival needs. Accuracy in basic grammatical relations is evident, although not consistent. May exhibit the more common forms of verb tenses, for example, but may make frequent errors in formation and selection. While some structures are established, errors occur in more complex patterns. The individual typically cannot sustain coherent structures in longer utterances or unfamiliar situations. Ability to describe and give precise information is limited. Person, space, and time references are often used incorrectly. Pronunciation is understandable to natives used to dealing with foreigners. Can combine most significant sounds with reasonable comprehensibility, but has difficulty in producing certain sounds in certain positions or in certain combinations. Speech will usually be labored. Frequently has to repeat utterances to be understood by the general public. (Has been coded S-1+ in some nonautomated applications.) [Computer Code 16]

Level 2 (Limited Working Proficiency)

Able to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements. Can handle routine work-related interactions that are limited in scope. In more complex and sophisticated work-related tasks, language usage generally disturbs the native speaker. Can handle with confidence, but not with facility, most normal, high-frequency social conversational situations including extensive, but casual conversations about current events, as well as work, family, and autobiographical information. The individual can get the gist of most everyday conversations but has some difficulty understanding native speakers in situations that require specialized or sophisticated knowledge. The individual's utterances are minimally cohesive. Linguistic structure is usually not very elaborate and not thoroughly controlled; errors are frequent. Vocabulary use is appropriate for high-frequency utterances, but unusual or imprecise elsewhere.

Examples: While these interactions will vary widely from individual to individual, the individual can typically ask and answer predictable questions in the workplace and give straightforward instructions to subordinates. Additionally, the individual can participate in personal and accommodation-type interactions with elaboration and facility; that is, can give and understand complicated, detailed, and extensive directions and make non-routine changes in travel and accommodation arrangements. Simple structures and basic grammatical relations are typically controlled; however, there are areas of weakness. In the commonly taught languages, these may be simple markings such as plurals, articles, linking words, and negatives or more complex structures such as tense/aspect usage, case morphology, passive constructions, word order, and embedding. (Has been coded S-2 in some nonautomated applications.) [Computer Code 20]

Level 2+ (Limited Working Proficiency, Plus)

Able to satisfy most work requirements with language usage that is often, but not always, acceptable and effective. The individual shows considerable ability to communicate effectively on topics relating to particular interests and special fields of competence. Often shows a high degree of fluency and ease of speech, yet when under tension or pressure, the ability to use the language effectively may deteriorate. Comprehension of normal native speech is typically nearly complete. The individual may miss cultural and local references and may require a native speaker to adjust to his/her limitations in some ways. Native speakers often perceive the individual's speech to contain awkward or inaccurate phrasing of ideas, mistaken time, space, and person references, or to be in some way inappropriate, if not strictly incorrect.

Examples: Typically the individual can participate in most social, formal, and informal interactions; but limitations either in range of contexts, types of tasks, or level of accuracy

hinder effectiveness. The individual may be ill at ease with the use of the language either in social interaction or in speaking at length in professional contexts. He/she is generally strong in either structural precision or vocabulary, but not in both. Weakness or unevenness in one of the foregoing, or in pronunciation, occasionally results in miscommunication. Normally controls, but cannot always easily produce general vocabulary. Discourse is often incohesive. (Has been coded S-2+ in some nonautomated applications.) [Computer Code 26]

Level 3 (General Professional Proficiency)

Able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics. Nevertheless, the individual's limitations generally restrict the professional contexts of language use to matters of shared knowledge and/or international convention. Discourse is cohesive. The individual uses the language acceptably, but with some noticeable imperfections; yet, errors virtually never interfere with understanding and rarely disturb the native speaker. The individual can effectively combine structure and vocabulary to convey his/her meaning accurately. The individual speaks readily and fills pauses suitably. In face-to-face conversation with natives speaking the standard dialect at a normal rate of speech, comprehension is quite complete. Although cultural references, proverbs, and the implications of nuances and idiom may not be fully understood, the individual can easily repair the conversation. Pronunciation may be obviously foreign. Individual sounds are accurate; but stress, intonation, and pitch control may be faulty.

Examples: Can typically discuss particular interests and special fields of competence with reasonable ease. Can use the language as part of normal professional duties such as answering objections, clarifying points, justifying decisions, understanding the essence of challenges, stating and defending policy, conducting meetings, delivering briefings, or other extended and elaborate informative monologues. Can reliably elicit information and informed opinion from native speakers. Structural inaccuracy is rarely the major cause of misunderstanding. Use of structural devices is flexible and elaborate. Without searching for words or phrases, the individual uses the language clearly and relatively naturally to elaborate concepts freely and make ideas easily understandable to native speakers. Errors occur in low-frequency and highly complex structures. (Has been coded S-3 in some nonautomated applications.) [Computer Code 30]

Level 3+ (General Professional Proficiency, Plus)

Is often able to use the language to satisfy professional needs in a wide range of sophisticated and demanding tasks.

Examples: Despite obvious strengths, may exhibit some hesitancy, uncertainty, effort, or errors which limit the range of language-use tasks that can be reliably performed. Typically there is particular strength in fluency and one or more, but not all, of the following: breadth of lexicon, including low- and medium-frequency items, especially socio-linguistic/cultural references and nuances of close synonyms; structural precision, with sophisticated features that are readily, accurately, and appropriately controlled (such as complex modification and embedding in Indo-European languages); discourse competence in a wide range of contexts and tasks, often matching a native speaker's strategic and organizational abilities and expectations. Occasional patterned errors occur in low frequency and highly-complex structures. (Has been coded S-3+ in some nonautomated applications.) [Computer Code 36]

Level 4 (Advanced Professional Proficiency)

Able to use the language fluently and accurately on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. The individual's language usage and ability to function are fully successful. Organizes discourse well, using appropriate rhetorical speech devices, native cultural references, and understanding. Language ability only rarely hinders him/her in performing any task requiring language; yet, the individual would seldom be perceived as a native. Speaks effortlessly and smoothly and is able to use the language with a high degree of effectiveness, reliability, and precision for all representational purposes within the range of personal and professional experience and scope of responsibilities. Can serve as an informal interpreter in a range of unpredictable circumstances. Can perform extensive, sophisticated language tasks, encompassing most matters of interest to well-educated native speakers, including tasks which do not bear directly on a professional specialty.

Examples: Can discuss in detail concepts which are fundamentally different from those of the target culture and make those concepts clear and accessible to the native speaker. Similarly, the individual can understand the details and ramifications of concepts that are culturally or conceptually different from his/her own. Can set the tone of interpersonal official, semi-official, and non-professional verbal exchanges with a representative range of native speakers (in a range of varied audiences, purposes, tasks, and

settings). Can play an effective role among native speakers in such contexts as conferences, lectures, and debates on matters of disagreement. Can advocate a position at length, both formally and in chance encounters, using sophisticated verbal strategies. Understands and reliably produces shifts of both subject matter and tone. Can understand native speakers of the standard and other major dialects in essentially any face-to-face interaction. (Has been coded S-4 in some nonautomated applications.) [Computer Code 40]

Level 4+ (Advanced Professional Proficiency, Plus)

Speaking proficiency is regularly superior in all respects, usually equivalent to that of a well-educated, highly articulate native speaker. Language ability does not impede the performance of any language-use task. However, the individual would not necessarily be perceived as culturally native.

Examples: The individual organizes discourse well, employing functional rhetorical speech devices, native cultural references and understanding. Effectively applies a native speaker's social and circumstantial knowledge. However, cannot sustain that performance under all circumstances. While the individual has a wide range and control of structure, an occasional non-native slip may occur. The individual has a sophisticated control of vocabulary and phrasing that is rarely imprecise, yet there are occasional weaknesses in idioms, colloquialisms, pronunciation, cultural reference or there may be an occasional failure to interact in a totally native manner. (Has been coded S-4+ in some nonautomated applications.) [Computer Code 46]

Level 5 (Functionally Native Proficiency)

Speaking proficiency is functionally equivalent to that of a highly articulate well-educated native speaker and reflects the cultural standards of the country where the language is natively spoken. The individual uses the language with complete flexibility and intuition, so that speech on all levels is fully accepted by well-educated native speakers in all of its features, including breadth of vocabulary and idiom, colloquialisms, and pertinent cultural references. Pronunciation is typically consistent with that of well-educated native speakers of a non-stigmatized dialect. (Has been coded S-5 in some nonautomated applications.) [Computer Code 50]

870305